

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

ACADEMIC SENATE - AGENDA

December 2, 1980

UU 220

3:00 PM

Chair, Tim Kersten
Vice Chair, Rod Keif
Secretary, John Harris

I. Minutes

II. Announcements

III. Reports

Academic Council (Keif)
Administrative Council (Harris)
CSUC Academic Senate (Hale, Riedlsperger, Weatherby)
Foundation Board (Kersten)
President's Council (Kersten)

IV. Committee Reports

Budget (Conway)	General Education and Breadth (Wenzl)
Constitution and Bylaws (O'Toole)	Instruction (Brown)
Curriculum (Harris)	Long Range Planning (Simmons)
Distinguished Teaching Award (Fierstine)	Personnel Policies (Goldenberg)
Election (Al-Hadad)	Personnel Review (Duarte)
Faculty Library (Swansen)	Research (Dingus)
Fairness Board (Rosenman)	Student Affairs (Moran)

V. Business Items

- A. Resolution Regarding Athletic Advisory Commission (Riedlsperger)
(Second Reading) (Attachment)
- B. Resolution Regarding Survey of Graduates (Simmons) (First Reading) (Attachment)
- C. Resolution Regarding Guidelines for Withdrawal from Classes after the
Census Date (Brown) (First Reading) (Attachment)
- D. Resolution to Modify the Dates for Personnel Actions (Goldenberg) (First
Reading) (Attachment)
- E. Resolution Regarding Enrollment Quota Determination (Conway) (First Reading)
(Attachment)
- F. Resolution Regarding Space and Facility Allocation (Conway) (First Reading)
(Attachment)

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

110
AS-103-80/EC (Rev.)
November 4, 1980

RESOLUTION REGARDING ATHLETIC ADVISORY COMMISSION

- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo accept the report of the Academic Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Athletics; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the report be forwarded to the President for inclusion in CAM, Section 172.

FUNCTION

The Athletic Advisory Commission serves as an advisory body to the President. The Commission shall be responsible for insuring that the goals of the athletic programs are consistent with the educational objectives of the University and that the educational pursuits of student athletes maintain priority over their involvement in intercollegiate sports. The Commission shall inform the President of the state of the athletic programs and shall submit recommendations regarding any needed revisions in both policy and practice as they pertain to the programs as well as to the faculty, staff, and students involved.

Specifically, responsibilities of the Commission shall include: 1) conducting a yearly review of both short and long range plans of the intercollegiate and intramural athletic programs; 2) conducting a yearly review of the budgets of intercollegiate athletics, intramural athletics, and the Physical Education Department to insure that they reflect the stated goals of the programs; 3) reviewing the relationship between the Physical Education Department and Intercollegiate Athletics Department; 4) review and make recommendations as appropriate to insure that the intercollegiate athletics program provides equity of opportunity for women and men; 5) reviewing the academic status and progress of intercollegiate athletes toward a degree and recommending any special programs designed to aid athletes in their educational pursuits; 6) reviewing the athletic recruitment program; and 7) reviewing the financial aid packages being given to athletics.

MEMBERSHIP

Commission appointments are made annually by the University President from nominations as indicated below. The committee elects its own chairperson. Appointments may not include staff members of the Intercollegiate Athletics program or students participating on an intercollegiate team. Committee membership is as follows:

- a. One representative from the Academic Affairs area, selected from nominations by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

- b. One representative from the Administrative Affairs area, selected from nominations by the Executive Vice President.
- c. One representative from the Student Affairs Division, selected by the Dean of Students.
- d. Two representatives from the Associated Students, Inc., selected from nominations by the ASI President.
- e. Three faculty representatives selected from nominations by the Chairperson of the Academic Senate (at least two of which shall be teaching faculty).
- f. Two faculty athletic representatives.
- g. The following are designated as ex-officio non-voting members:
 - 1) The Director and Assistant Directors of the Intercollegiate Athletics Program.
 - 2) The Head of the Physical Education Department.
 - 3) The Title IX Coordinator.

Efforts shall be made to insure equitable representation of women on the Commission.

The term of office shall be two years. To insure continuity of service, initial appointments will be for either two- or three-year periods. Subsequent appointments shall be for a two-year period. No appointee shall serve for more than six consecutive years.

MEETINGS

Meetings shall be held monthly during the academic year or more frequently as scheduled by the Commission Chairperson. It is expected that the Commission will meet at least once a year with the University President.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-104-80/LRP
November 18, 1980

RESOLUTION REGARDING SURVEY OF GRADUATES

- WHEREAS, A major goal of the university is to prepare students for employment in fields for which they were educated or in related fields; and
- WHEREAS, The education received should prepare graduates for promotion to positions of increasing responsibility and leadership; and
- WHEREAS, Data on the success of graduates is necessary to modify curricula to meet changes in employment fields; and
- WHEREAS, The Placement survey questionnaire mailed to students at graduation provides only limited information and not the data needed for effective long-range planning; therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommends to President Baker that the Placement Office be authorized and financed to begin a revised schedule of surveys of graduates beginning with the class of 1980-1981; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That continuing surveys be conducted of graduates in their fifth, tenth, and fifteenth years after graduation; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the faculties of the University, with the assistance of the Placement Office and other appropriate campus agencies, design the survey forms for their disciplines; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the confidentiality of individual responders be ensured; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That data and interpretations of data be available to those responsible for long-range planning.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-103-80/IC
November 18, 1980

RESOLUTION REGARDING GUIDELINES FOR WITHDRAWAL
FROM CLASSES AFTER THE CENSUS DATE

Background: A student may currently petition to withdraw from a class after the census date, but prior to the start of the eighth week. According to the catalog, the petition will be approved and the withdrawal authorized "only if there are serious and compelling reasons for the withdrawal in the judgment of the instructor and the department head." The petition requires the signature of both the instructor and the department head.

The definition of "serious and compelling reasons" recommended by the Academic Council in December 1976 were approved by President Kennedy in February 1977. But the definitions were never addressed by the Academic Senate nor have they been published in the catalog. In January 1980, the CSUC Academic Senate recommended local campus Senates to develop guidelines for evaluating the "serious and compelling reasons."

- WHEREAS, The university is impacted and many courses are oversubscribed, students should be expected to make a commitment to their courses prior to the census date; and
- WHEREAS, The university recognizes that there are "serious and compelling" reasons for which a student might need to withdraw from a class or classes; and
- WHEREAS, Each student should have available both the procedures and the kinds of reasons the university considers sufficiently serious and compelling to warrant withdrawal; and
- WHEREAS, The instructor of the course is the proper person to be consulted on the options available to the student with respect to progress within the course; and
- WHEREAS, The student's advisor is the proper person to be consulted concerning the ramifications of dropping a particular class or classes in terms of progress toward graduation; and
- WHEREAS, Neither the instructor nor advisor should be in the position of evaluating the serious and compelling reason for the petition to withdraw; and
- WHEREAS, The Academic Council has determined that the department heads are able to evaluate the serious and compelling reasons for withdrawal petitions; therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the following procedures for withdrawing from classes after the census date be adopted and be included in the catalog and the Campus Administrative Manual:

Procedure:

- a. Any student wishing to withdraw from a class between the third and seventh weeks of a quarter must petition to do so. Withdrawal petitions are available at the Records Office.
- b. The student shall consult both with the instructor of the course that is being dropped and with his/her advisor. Both the instructor and the advisor signatures must be obtained on the petition.
- c. The student shall present his or her petition to the instructor's department head, and the department head, after any appropriate consultation, shall grant approval or not in accordance with the guidelines set forth below.

and be it further

RESOLVED: That the following guidelines for interpretation of "serious and compelling reasons for withdrawal" be adopted and be included in the catalog and Campus Administrative Manual:

Guidelines for Serious and Compelling Reasons

After the census date a student may not drop a class and receive a "W" on the permanent record unless there is a "serious and compelling" reason. Whether the reason advanced by a student is in fact serious and compelling is a matter that requires judgment and interpretation.

It is not possible to describe in advance all the reasons that are acceptable or not acceptable as serious and compelling. The guidelines below should serve to illustrate the intent. Each case should be considered on its own merits.

1. Medical. Serious illness or injury of the student or of his/her immediate family which has resulted in inability to make up course material missed. Verification by the University Health Center or by the student's personal physician may be required.
2. Financial. For many different reasons a student's financial situation may become so critical that withdrawal from the University is the only recourse. In other cases, withdrawal from a part of the student's course list may be indicated. A student who requests withdrawal after the census date for financial reasons must offer an explanation for his decision to withdraw and may be asked for verification.
3. Personal. Problems of a psychological or other personal nature may indicate withdrawal from a course in order to preserve reasonable progress toward a student's educational goals. Depending upon the nature of the problem, appropriate verification by the University Counseling Center or the Health Center may be required.
4. Other. Withdrawals are permitted after the third week to correct faculty or administrative error as verified by the appropriate department head or

the Registrar.

There may be other serious and compelling reasons to withdraw from classes. Each such case is to be considered on its own merits.

It should be emphasized that poor grades, irregular attendance, or dissatisfaction with the course are not in themselves sufficient reasons to withdraw after the census date. The official drop period--the first three weeks of each quarter--is the proper time to evaluate preparation level, time commitment, normal progress, interest, etc., for each class.

Each school may further interpret these guidelines as to what constitutes "serious and compelling" reasons.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-107-80/PPC
December 2, 1980

RESOLUTION TO MODIFY THE DATES FOR PERSONNEL ACTIONS

Background: Last year, the Personnel Review Committee requested a change be made in the calendar for personnel action in order to provide them a reasonable amount of time for their part of the process. The Personnel Policies Committee submitted a proposal, which was approved by the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate proposal did provide adequate time for the Personnel Review Committee, but would, as it turns out, cause many difficulties for the Administration. Vice President Hazel Jones considered the situation, and she wrote her own proposal. She sent her proposal to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. Copies of her proposal were then sent to the Personnel Review Committee and the Personnel Policies Committee. The Personnel Review Committee felt that the VPAA proposal for third, fourth, fifth and sixth year considerations, and the promotions sections were fine, but preferred the Senate plan for first and second year considerations. With additional consultation with the Personnel Review Committee, Don Shelton and Hazel Jones, it was learned that there is no activity in the first year or second year considerations. Also, Don Shelton stated that the September 20 deadline is impossible for his office.

It is felt that the new timetable will provide the needed time for the Personnel Review Committee, which was the original objective. It is therefore appropriate that the Senate pass the following resolution.

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate endorse the proposed changes in the calendar for personnel actions, as proposed by Vice President Hazel Jones.

(All calendars under consideration are attached for your information.)

PROPOSED DEADLINE CHANGES IN FACULTY PERSONNEL ACTIONS

	Current Date	Proposed Changes: Acad. Senate VPAA		Mandated (Title 5)
<u>Three, Four, Five and Six Years Considerations</u>				
Materials submitted:				
DH to Dean	Nov. 1	Oct. 20	Nov. 1	-
Dean to VPAA	Dec. 1	Dec. 1	Dec. 5	-
VPAA to PRC	Dec. 5	Nov. 20	Dec. 10	-
PRC to VPAA	Dec. 15	Dec. 15	Jan. 15	-
Announce decisions	Jan. 10	Jan. 10	Feb. 5	June 1
<u>II. Promotions</u>				
Materials submitted:				
DH to Dean	Feb. 10	Feb. 1	Feb. 10	-
Dean to VPAA	Mar. 10	Mar. 1	Mar. 10	-
VPAA to PRC	Mar. 15	Mar. 5	Mar. 15	-
PRC to Pres.	Apr. 10	Apr. 10	May 1	-
Announce decisions	May 1	May 1	June 1	-
<u>III. First Year Considerations</u>				
Materials submitted:				
DH to Dean	Jan. 17	Jan. 17	Jan. 17	-
Dean to VPAA	Jan. 31	Jan. 24	Jan. 31	-
VPAA to PRC	Feb. 9	Jan. 31	Feb. 9	-
PRC to VPAA	Feb. 19	Feb. 19	Feb. 19	-
Announce decisions				Mar. 1
<u>IV. Second Year Considerations</u>				
Faculty Position Roster Sent by Personnel:				
	Oct. 1	Sept. 20	Oct. 1	-
DH to Dean	Nov. 1	Oct. 20	Nov. 1	-
Dean to VPAA	Nov. 15	Nov. 1	Nov. 15	-
VPAA to PRC	Nov. 19	Nov. 6	Nov. 19	-
PRC to VPAA	Dec. 1	Dec. 1	Dec. 1	-
Announce decisions				Dec. 15

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-105-80/BC
November 18, 1980

RESOLUTION CONCERNING ENROLLMENT QUOTA DETERMINATION

- WHEREAS, The determination of enrollment quotas and long-range enrollment guidelines for each school at this university is potentially the single most important decision affecting the character, quality and operation of the University; and
- WHEREAS, Shifts in enrollment quotas from lower cost programs to higher cost programs, and vice versa, affect the allocation of resources at the university, particularly in a time of limited resources; and
- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate had been consulted directly in the annual review of the college growth rate and distribution of enrollment by school (AB 71-1); and
- WHEREAS, The Academic Senate is now only indirectly involved in the annual review process consultation via informal contact through the President's Council Meetings (AB 74-3, revised); and
- WHEREAS, Enrollment quotas have not been discussed at the President's Council Meetings this year, and a decision on this matter must be made between November 1 and November 15 of each year (AB 74-3, revised); and
- WHEREAS, It is realized that the prime responsibility for setting enrollment targets and guidelines rests with the university president (AB 74-3, revised); therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That whenever policy decisions are to be made concerning enrollment quotas and long-range enrollment guidelines, formal consultation should occur between the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and a representative of the university administration. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate will then decide if further consultation on the part of the Senate is required, and route it to the appropriate committees for action.

BACKGROUND MATERIAL CONCERNING BUDGET COMMITTEE'S SPACE ALLOCATION
RESOLUTION:

The amount of space allocated to an instructional program at Cal Poly is determined by state formulas involving FPE(Full Time Equivalent Students) and FTEF(Full Time Equivalent Faculty Members) generated by each school. The average is about 3.5 square feet per FPE, according to Executive Dean Douglas Gerard. Figures concerning FPE and FTEF are determined for the campus each March, and are submitted to the board of trustees along with campus proposals for major and minor capital outlay programs. These proposals are developed through consultation between the President, Executive Vice President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President's Council, and the Executive Dean. No consultation takes place presently with the Academic Senate or its committees(i.e., Long Range Planning and Budget Committees) concerning space allocation at Cal Poly.

Important decisions affecting the instructional program are made at the University level involving the allocation of space, both in new construction and in renovated buildings on campus. A rank ordered priority list is developed on campus concerning both major and minor (projects costing less than \$100,000.00) capital outlay programs. Also use of renovated space(existing facilities which become vacant due to new construction - i.e., Dexter Library and Chase Hall) is determined by the University administration.

A current example of the renovation concept can be seen in the allocation of space in the old Dexter Library with the move into the Robert E. Kennedy library scheduled over quarter break before winter quarter begins. Only two general purpose classrooms are planned for this building, a building which the Chancellor's Office statewide restriction against the construction of general classroom facilities(as quoted in AB 74-3) does not apply to. Although, according to Dean Gerard, 'there is no shortage of general classroom facilities at the University, when the whole academic day is considered,' some questions could be asked. Could we replace some of the inadequate general classroom facilities, which are now utilized, by better ones in the Dexter Library complex? Why are only two general classroom facilities being considered for perhaps the only building in the foreseeable future, where a significant number of general purpose classroom facilities could be constructed? The new Engineering South Building, the next major construction project for the campus, will only have two general purpose classrooms built into it. This is only one issue that could be raised, if the Academic Senate by way of its committees was consulted in the space allocation decision making process.

The timeliness of the issue is apparent from the impacted status of the University, which makes space allocation an even more important concern. Therefore the following resolution is presented calling for consultation between the administration and the Academic Senate concerning space and facility allocation at the University.

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

AS-106-80/BC
November 18, 1980

RESOLUTION ON CONSULTATION IN SPACE ALLOCATION

- WHEREAS, The allocation of space and facilities on a university campus comprises a significant resource; and
- WHEREAS, This resource becomes even more important when the university campus, like Cal Poly's, faces an impacted status for several years; and
- WHEREAS, Some flexibility and discretion exists at the local campus level in the CSUC system concerning the allocation of this resource; and
- WHEREAS, The allocation of this resource impinges directly upon the quality of the instructional programs at Cal Poly; and
- WHEREAS, Currently the faculty at Cal Poly, who have the primary responsibility for instruction, have minimal input into the space allocation process via the Academic Senate and its committees, therefore be it
- RESOLVED: That the administration of California Polytechnic State University should engage in meaningful consultation with the Academic Senate via the Executive Committee, and appropriate subordinate committees, as deemed necessary by the Executive Committee, whenever decisions are being made concerning current or future space allocation on the campus.